

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

In the specification, certain paragraphs have been amended to correct grammatical and typographical errors. The amendments also clarify the reference numbers used in the figures. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added to the specification.

Claims 1-6 are currently being amended, and claims 9-15 are being added. The amendments to claims 1-6, with the exception of the amended language of claim 1 discussed below, are only for readability and grammar, and not for reasons related to patentability.

This amendment changes, adds, and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-15 are now pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 3-8

In Section 3 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0010634 (Yokoi).

Applicant claims “a magnetic force” and “an elastic force, wherein a difference between the magnetic force and the elastic force is not constant to change a moving speed of the shade as the shade moves position.” (Claim 1 as currently amended). Yokoi discloses a headlamp with “resilient strips” intended to absorb impact and dampen noise when a shade shifts position. (¶ 0022). Yokoi also discloses “a return spring 38 mounted on a movable iron core 36” and a “solenoid 34” for moving the shade. (¶ 0048). However, Yokoi does not

disclose “a difference” between the force of the solenoid and the force of the spring that is not constant to change the shade’s moving speed as the shade shifts position, as in present claim 1.

Yokoi gives no indication of having a non-constant difference between the magnetic force and the elastic force to change the moving speed of the shade as it shifts position, which reduces noise by attenuating the impact incurred when the shade contacts the stopper mechanism. Yokoi does not address attenuate the impact of the shade itself. Instead, Yokoi discloses “resilient strips” that absorb impact by becoming “resiliently deformed.” (¶ 0059). Further, Yokoi discloses that the “movable shade 22...*abuts...against the resilient strip 32D...immediately before the resilient urging force of the return spring 38 is destroyed.*” (¶ 0059; Emphasis added). Thus, Yokoi does not disclose a system where moving forces act in conjunction to attenuate impact by changing the actual moving speed of the shade as it shifts position. Yokoi only discloses resilient strips to absorb the spring’s impact when the shade shifts position.

Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1, as currently amended, is not anticipated by Yokoi. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 1 based on Yokoi.

Claims 1, 2, and 8

In Section 5 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,899,559 (Lachmayer et al.)

Claim 1 recites in part a magnetic force and an elastic force, “wherein a difference between the magnetic force and the elastic force is not constant to change a moving speed of the shade as the shade moves position.” (Claim 1 as currently amended). The non-constant difference between the magnetic force and the elastic force acts to reduce noise by attenuating the impact incurred when the shade contacts the stopper mechanism. Lachmayer et al. discloses a headlamp with a “remote-controlled adjusting device” where the “adjusting device need not result in any increase in structural dimensions of the headlamp.” (Col. 2, lines 13-17). As Applicant points out in background section of the present specification, the

Lachmayer et al. device makes an annoying noise when the shade abuts the stopping mechanisms. Lachmayer et al. does not disclose any configuration to attenuate impact as in claim 1.

Lachmayer et al. discloses “stop-motion devices 35 and 19...formed by an inside of the structural unit 21.” (Col. 4, lines 65-66). The stop-motion devices absorb the impact when the screen is pivoted. Lachmayer et al. also discloses a “holding device 17” (spring), the force of which “presses the screen 4 into the low-beam light position.” (Col. 4, lines 11-15). Further, when the low beam is activated, a “second electromagnet 18 is activated, and its force, in addition to the force of the holding device 17, holds the screen 4 in the low-beam light position.” (Col. 4, lines 17-20). This additional force of the second electromagnet, or “permanent magnet” disclosed in other embodiments of Lachmayer et al. (col. 4, lines 28-38), acts to create additional impact, causing more noise when the shade shifts position.

Lachmayer et al. has no disclosure to have the magnetic force of the solenoid and the elastic force of the spring non-constant to change a moving speed of the shade as the shade moves position. Lachmayer simply places bumpers to absorb the impact itself.

Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1, as currently amended, is not anticipated by Lachmayer et al. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 1 based on Lachmayer et al.

The dependent claims 2-8 are patentable at least based on their dependency to claim 1. As to new claims 9-12 and 14-15, which find support throughout the specification, they are patentable at least based on their dependency on claim 1, as well as their own patentable subject matter.

As to new claim 13, applicant respectfully asserts that neither of the applied references disclose a shade that “slides substantially parallel to an optic axis of the light source.” (Claim 13). This feature is exemplified in the figures of the present application. Yokoi discloses a shade that rotates back and forth about an “axis of rotation A.” (¶ 0059; ¶ 0061). Lachmayer et al. discloses a screen that “pivot[s] about an axis 10.” (Col. 3, lines 25-26). The applied references do not disclose a shade that “slides” or a shade that slides in a direction

"substantially parallel to an optic axis of the light source." Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that added claim 13 is allowable.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 21, 2005

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428

22428

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Pavan K. Agarwal ^{Reg. No. 40,888}
/s/ Pavan K. Agarwal
Registration No. 40,888

Attorney for Applicant